(ii) Application of Model Code of Conduct of the Election in certain States (like Bihar in December, 1994) and the Lok Sabha General Elections during 1996; (iii) Late receipt of recommendations/non-receipt of recommendations from the Members of Parliament concerned; and (iv) Changes in recommendations by

Members of Parliament, (d) The guidelines of Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme were revised in February, 1997 and it is expected that utilisation of MPLADS funds may gain momentum.

Plan Investment by States

3130. SHRI SANJAY DALMIA: Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state:

(b) the defaulting States which have not achieved the targeted Plan investment for 1995-96;

(c) the main reasons for not utilising the Plan investments. State-wise;

(d) the action taken by Government against the major defaulting States during the above period; and

(e) the extent to which their Plan outlay for 1996-97 was reduced?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH): (a) to (d) Under the existing guidelines of the Planning Commission, the normal plan assistance from the Central Government is given to the States to the full extend if the actual plan expenditure of the States does not fall below the originally approved outlay and the expenditure for earmarked sectors/schemes does not fall below the approved outlays for the same. In case of special category states, they are allowed to use uplo 20% of plan assistance to meet their non plan gap and cuts in central assistance are applied keeping the above in consideration. The actual expenditure figures for Annual Plan 1995-96 for the States are not yet available. Planning Commission had approved revised Plan outlays at a lower level than the originally approved outlays in respect of 16 States whose list is at Statement (See below). The main reason for revised outlays of these States being lower than the originally approved outlays was the shortfall in achieving the projected figures of States' own resources. The question of imposing a cut in Central assistance in respect of these States will arise if the total expenditure turns out to be lower than revised approved outlay or the actual expenditure for earmarked sector/schemes falls below the approved outlays for them. The originally approved outlays for all the State,s in 1996-97 were at a higher level as compared to their revised outlays for 1995-96.

Statement

List of the States

(a) Andhra Pradesh

(b) Arunachal Pradesh

(c) Assam

(d) Bihar

(e) Goa

(f) Haryana

(g) Karnataka

(h) Madhya Pradesh

(i) Manipur

(b) Meghalaya

(c) Nagaland

(d) Orissa

(e) Punjab

(f) Sikkim

(g) Tripura

(h) Uttar Pradesh

ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में पिछड़ेपन और बेरोजगारी को हल करने के लिए योजनाएं

3131. श्री नागमणि : क्या योजना और कार्यक्रम कार्यान्वयन मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या सरकार ने बिहार के ग्रामिण क्षेत्रों और अन्य पिछड़े राज्यों में पिछड़ेपन और बेरोजगारी की समस्या को हल करने के लिए कोई योजना तैयार की है;